SOLICITOR

AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

DEC 19 2008

U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

TO: Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District of California on the following x Patents or ☐ Trademarks:

DOCKET NO.	DATE FILED	U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CV 08-05590 HRL	12/16/2008	280 South First Street, Rm 2112, San Jose, CA 95113

PLAINTIFF	DEFENDANT
MEDIMMUNE	PDL BIOPHARMA

	PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1	5,585,089		SEE ATTACHED COMPLAIN
2	5,693,761		
3	5,693,762		
4	6,180,370		
5	7,022,500		

In the above—entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY ☐ Amendment ☐ Answer ☐ Cross Bill ☐ Other Pleading	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		

In the above—entitled case, the following decision has been rendered or judgement issued:

DECISION/JUDGEMENT

CLERK	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE
Richard W. Wieking	Betty Walton	December 17, 2008

Copy 1—Upon initiation of action, mail this copy to Commissioner **Copy 3—Upon termination of action, mail this copy to Commissioner**
Copy 2—Upon filing document adding patent(s), mail this copy to Commissioner **Copy 4–Case file copy**

JEFFREY E. FAUCETTE (No. 193066)
Email: jfaucette@howardrice.com
HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY FALK & RABKIN
A Professional Corporation
Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4024
Telephone: 415/434-1600
Facsimile: 415/217-5910

GERSON A. ZWEIFACH
PAUL B. GAFFNEY
AARON P. MAURER
DAVID I. BERL (No. 211761)
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP
725 Twelfth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-5901
Telephone: 202/434-5000
Facsimile: 202/434-5029

ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN, CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN, P.C.
Five Becker Farm Road
Roseland, New Jersey 07068-1739
Telephone: 973/994-1700
Facsimile: 973/994-1744

Attorneys for Plaintiff MEDIMMUNE, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

HRL

CV 08 5891

MEDIMMUNE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

PDL BIOPHARMA, INC.,

Defendant.

No.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF PATENT INVALIDITY AND CONTRACTUAL RIGHTS

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff MedImmune, LLC (f/k/a MedImmune, Inc.)., by its attorneys, for its Complaint, alleges as follows:

1. This is an action for declaratory relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. §§2201. MedImmune seeks a declaration that U.S. Patent Nos. 5,585,089, 5,693,761, 5,693,762, 6,180,370, and 7,022,500 are invalid, and that MedImmune owes no payments under a patent license agreement with PDL BioPharma, Inc. (f/k/a Protein Design Labs, Inc.), ("PDL"), assignee of the patents.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

2. Plaintiff MedImmune, LLC. ("MedImmune") is a biotechnology company with its principal place of business in Gaithersburg, Maryland. MedImmune uses biotechnology to develop and produce antibody therapies, including for the prevention of serious lower respiratory tract disease caused by respiratory syncytial virus ("RSV") in vulnerable infants.

3. PDL is a biopharmaceutical company with its headquarters at 1400 Seaport Blvd., Redwood City, CA. On information and belief, PDL is the assignee of United States Patent Nos. 5,585,089, 5,693,761, 5,693,762, 6,180,370, and 7,022,500 (collectively, "the PDL patents"), entitled Humanized Immunoglobulins, directed to, *inter alia*, certain humanized antibodies and methods of preparing such antibodies. PDL is the successor-in-interest of PDL BioPharma, Inc.

4. On information and belief, PDL's headquarters in Redwood City are its only place of business in the United States.

5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1337, 1338(a), and 2201. This Court has jurisdiction over any state law claims asserted hereunder pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant PDL because the company has its principal place of business in this district and, on information and belief, regularly transacts business within this District in a substantial, continuous and systematic way.

7. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1391 and 1400(b), because PDL has its principal place of business in this district, resides in this district and is subject to personal jurisdiction in this district.

BACKGROUND

8. In 1997, PDL BioPharma, Inc., the predecessor-in-interest of PDL granted the predecessor-in-interest of MedImmune a license to develop, manufacture, and sell anti-RSV anti-bodies that would otherwise infringe a valid claim of certain patents of PDL, including the PDL patents, in exchange for a royalty on sales of such products (hereinafter, "License Agreement").

9. In the 1990s MedImmune developed the humanized antibody palivizumab for the treatment of RSV. Palivizumab received FDA approval in 1998 and has been sold since then under the trade name Synagis®. Since then MedImmune has made regular royalty payments to PDL under the License Agreement on sales of Synagis®.

10. MedImmune has developed a next-generation anti-RSV antibody, motavizumab. A Biologic License Application to market motavizumab for the prevention of lower respiratory tract disease caused by RSV was filed by MedImmune in January 2008 and accepted for filing as a standard application in March 2008. MedImmune has prepared commercial quantities of motavizumab and expects to initiate marketing of this product upon FDA approval.

11. PDL has taken the position that the PDL patents are valid and that both Synagis® and motavizumab infringe the PDL patents.

COUNT I—DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF INVALIDITY

12. MedImmune incorporates each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

13. United States Patent No. 5,585,089 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double

patenting.

14. United States Patent No. 5,693,761 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

15. United States Patent No. 5,693,762 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

16. United States Patent No. 6,180,370 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

17. United States Patent No. 7,022,500 is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

18. MedImmune hereby seeks a declaratory judgment that each of the PDL patents is invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

COUNT II—DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF CONTRACTUAL RIGHTS

19. MedImmune incorporates each of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

20. Royalties are owed under the License Agreement for Synagis® and motavizumab manufactured and sold in the U.S. only if the development, importation, manufacture, use, or sale of Synagis® and/or motavizumab would, but for the License Agreement, infringe a valid claim of the PDL patents.

21. Because the parties dispute whether Synagis® and motavizumab whether the PDL patents are valid, an actual controversy exists between the parties concerning the rights and obligations of MedImmune under the terms of the License Agreement.

22. MedImmune has no obligation to make payments to PDL under the License Agreement pertaining to Synagis® or motavizumab that is manufactured and sold, because Synagis® and motavizumab do not infringe any valid claim of the PDL patents. The basis for invalidity of the PDL Patents arises under the patent laws of the United States, 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting.

23. MedImmune hereby seeks a declaratory judgment that it owes no payments under the License Agreement pertaining to Synagis® or motavizumab, that is manufactured and sold in the United States, and that any payments made to PDL under the License Agreement, post-dating this Complaint, based on sales of Synagis® or motavizumab, that is manufactured, sold and used in the United States, are subject to the equitable powers of the Court.

HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY FALK & RABKIN
A Professional Corporation

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff MedImmune requests that judgment be entered in favor of MedImmune and against PDL and requests the following relief:

(a) A declaration that the PDL patents are invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103, 112, *et seq.* and/or the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting;

(b) A declaration that PDL is not entitled to any royalties on sales of Synagis® and motavizumab that is manufactured and sold in the United States because the PDL patents are invalid;

(c) A declaration that this in an exceptional case and an award of attorneys' fees pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §285;

(d) Costs and expenses in this action; and

(e) Such further and other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

DATED: December 15, 2008.

Respectfully,

GERSON A. ZWEIFACH
PAUL B. GAFFNEY
AARON P. MAURER
DAVID I. BERL
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
CARELLA, BYRNE, BAIN, GILFILLAN, CECCHI, STEWART & OLSTEIN, P.C.

JEFFREY E. FAUCETTE
HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY FALK & RABKIN
A Professional Corporation

By: _____
JEFFREY E. FAUCETTE

Attorneys for Plaintiff MEDIMMUNE, LLC

HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY FALK & RABKIN
A Professional Corporation